

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are presently active; Claims 22-28 having been canceled without prejudice, and Claims 1 and 11 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the restriction requirement was made final. Claims 1-7, 10-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Komano (U.S. Pat. No. 5,375,005). Claims 8-9 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komano.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify that stopper pieces (or first stopper pieces) for alignment of the display panel are formed in the side faces and the end faces of the annular picture frame and extend inward from the annular picture frame, as shown for example in Applicants' Figure 3 where for the sake of clarity the mold frame is not shown. As such, Applicants note that such a configuration permits the display panel to be received at the extended tip portion of the stopper pieces to carry out alignment of the panel.

In Komano, those pieces on the supporting frame 13 identified in the outstanding Office Action as stopper pieces (i.e., parts 78 in Figure 1 thereof) extend not inward but rather extend downward to engage with complementary pieces on the light guiding plate 21. Indeed, the parts 78 of Komano are mere claws for caulking of a front panel which as noted extend downward and do not contribute to alignment of the panel.<sup>1</sup> Thus, those pieces in Komano identified in the outstanding Office Action as stopper pieces are not only structurally different than the defined stopper pieces of Claims 1 and 11, but also function differently.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Komano, the notch portion 56 of the positioning unit 33 aligns the panel as shown in Figure 4.

Application No. 09/921,567  
Reply to Office Action of December 19, 2003


Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Komano of stopper pieces extending inward from the annular picture frame, as defined in independent Claims 1 and 11.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 requires for anticipation that each and every feature of the claimed invention must be shown. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 11 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over the applied prior art of Komano.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\212404US\AM.DOC